

Applicants provisionally elect Group II-(F), with traverse, because the alleged separate inventions in fact are related and should be examined together. Additionally, the restriction is improper because examination of groups I and II, and even more so groups (A)-(F), would not require additional searches or otherwise place a serious burden on the PTO. MPEP 803 recites that, if "the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions."

For these reasons, the examiner is asked to reconsider her position and to withdraw the restriction requirement, in order that Group I and Group II can be examined as one invention. At the very least, applicants request that groups (A)-(F) be examined as one invention. In any event, applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application directed to non-elected claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request examination on the merits of this application. Should there be any questions concerning this application, Examiner Bui is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

November 1, 2002

FOLEY & LARDNER
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5109
Telephone: (202) 672-5404
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By

Richard C. Peet

Richard C. Peet
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,792